

10/91 Ordination of Women to the Priesthood

(A Report to Synod)

(A report from a committee appointed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney representing the views of members of that committee. Though reserving their own opinions concerning some of the substance of this report, the members of the committee have agreed to the report being printed for the Synod in this form.)

Preamble

1. In 1991 Synod passed the following motion (10/91) regarding the issue of the ordination of women:

"That this Synod, in recognising the tension within our Church arising from disagreement over appropriate roles for women in ministry, especially in regard to the ordination of women to the priesthood –

- (a) commits itself to a time of intensive prayer, investigation and dialogue over the issue, and
- (b) to facilitate this, appoints a committee consisting Bishop R H Goodhew (Chairman), Mr G R Christmas, Dr C Forbes, Mrs M Gabbott, the Revs R E Heslehurst, N Jarrett and T Harris (with power to co-opt), with a brief to organise a public conference to be held in 1992, involving participants chosen as to fairly reflect the range of positions held on this issue, and that Synod members be encouraged to attend this conference; and
- (c) requests this committee to present a report to the 1992 Synod in which points of agreement, points at issue, and reasons for disagreement be outlined."

2. There were nine meetings. The attendances at those meetings were -

<i>Name</i>	<i>Attended</i>
Mr G.R. Christmas	6
Dr C.B. Forbes	8
Mrs M. Gabbott	5
Bishop R.H. Goodhew	5
The Rev T.J. Harris	9
Canon R.E. Heslehurst	6
The Rev N. Jarrett	6

3. The committee explored both some of the substantive issues and the process of establishing a conference. It was decided to hold a day conference at St John's Parramatta on 27th June, 1992. This would take the form of positional presentations with opportunity for audience participation and responses. The people chosen to address the conference were selected on the basis of two criteria; 1) that they were generally recognised as being within the evangelical tradition of the Anglican Church of Australia and 2) that they had demonstrated some expertise in the area under discussion and could ably represent one of the major positions held in the debate. Whilst the fact that all the speakers were men was disappointing, this was due to the fact that those females approached were unable to speak on that occasion.

4. Publicity concerning the conference was distributed to all Synod members, women involved in various ministry positions throughout the Diocese, and through *Southern Cross*. The conference held at Parramatta was attended by over 370 people. On a scale of one to five concerning the value of the conference (five indicating "very worthwhile"), the average evaluation was 4.53 (102 responses). The papers and audio tapes from that conference are available on request from the Secretary of the Committee, the Rev T Harris.

Framework for discussion: significant common ground:

5. It would be a daunting and perhaps foolish task to write a report which attempts to represent the whole spectrum of views current within the evangelical community. It would be a perilous aim to purport to speak for others. This report is therefore written from the varying perspectives of the committee, within which we believe there is a reasonably representative cross-section of outlook (although see also the dissenting note, paras 141-144, and additional comment, paras). We recognise, however, that contrary views are inevitable at every stage, even where there may be agreement across the committee. However, the representative range of the committee will suffice to outline in general terms both broad areas of agreement, as well as points at which a variety of views may be pursued. Where statements express a degree of consensus, as well as alternative positions, this is therefore to be understood from the perspective of the committee. We make no attempt to claim any more than this. The criteria we have set for this report are that it should:

- (1) be free from error in statements of fact, and
- (2) be a fair presentation of respective perspectives and opinions.

6. This report is written firmly and unashamedly from an evangelical perspective. All contributors affirm Scripture as the living Word of God. With this agreed foundation and framework, the following *debate is not about whether we accept Scripture or not*. There is no dispute concerning our willingness to submit to Scriptural authority.

7. With the authority of Scripture recognised, this report also proceeds on the basis that all Scripture requires interpretation and application from one context to another. On most issues, this process of understanding a Scriptural passage in its original context and applying it to God's people today is relatively direct and uncontroversial. There are some issues, however, where that process of understanding and application from one context to another is complex and requires matters of fine judgement.

8. The central problem, therefore, does not relate to the principle of accepting the authority of Scripture, but the differing judgements concerning this process of interpretation and application in the complex area of understanding what the Bible has to say about male and female relationships and roles. Such interpretations then need to be applied to our current circumstances and specifically to the issue of the ordination of women to the priesthood within the Anglican Church.

9. We recognise that not all view the central issues in this way, but the integrity of this common starting point within the evangelical community should at least be acknowledged and respected on all sides. The framework for the debate within an evangelical context therefore has significant common ground.

10. Differences in judgement appear in at least two principal areas: exegesis and hermeneutics. Exegesis concerns the task of understanding a text within its original context, taking into consideration what can be perceived of the intended meaning by the author, together with the likely understanding of the original recipients. Hermeneutics concerns the way in which Scripture is to be interpreted: how various passages are to be brought together into some sort of theological and interpretive synthesis and with the discerning of Biblical patterns. It further concerns how the results of exegesis and perceived theological patterns are to be applied to our context today.

11. There are therefore in some instances (despite wide areas of agreement) differing opinions about the meaning of a passage in its original context, and sometimes differing opinions concerning its relevance and application today.

Two lines of interpretation: terminology:

12. There exist at present no agreed terms to describe the alternative perspectives involved. There are many more than two possible lines of interpretation, with each perspective containing a whole spectrum of differences. It is not our purpose to reflect such variety, but to portray in broad strokes the general contours of the case against the ordination of women to the priesthood, and the case in favour. This will inevitably draw in much wider issues dealing with men and women, but we have tried to keep our focus on what is relevant to the ordination to the priesthood issue. It is the unqualified desire of the committee as a whole to *affirm as strongly as possible the value of the ministries by women within our Church*.

13. It is our intention, therefore, to outline two lines of argument (which may concur at many points). Various terms have been suggested to describe these two lines of argument; none is wholly satisfactory. In reference to those in favour of women's ordination to the priesthood, the label "biblical (or evangelical) feminism" has sometimes been adopted. However, "feminism" is a very varied movement, and the term evokes a wide range of reactions, some positive, others negative, and the term is still used (unfortunately) pejoratively by some. The title "Christians for Biblical Equality" has become accepted in the United States as representing an "egalitarian" outlook on ministry.¹ This term, too, is not perceived by some as being strictly accurate. It may be construed as implying that those not accepting that position do not regard women as equal, which would be an unfair perception. The title could be seen as begging the real issue concerning the sense in which women are equal - equal before God (accepted by all), or equal in access to ministry within the church?

14. On the other side of the issue, the term "traditional" or "traditionalist" view² is adopted. These have been the most widely used and understood terms in the debate to date, but there has been a move more recently away from employing them. The terms "male headship" and "biblical subordination" are also used, but neither of these is without difficulty. Representatives of both sides accept male headship, but differ markedly over how they understand "headship". Similarly, "subordination" may be understood quite differently, and like "headship" may be applied in quite different contexts. More recently, those associated with the view which wants to restrict women's leadership within the church have proposed that their position be known as "Biblical Complementarity"³. Yet this term is also inaccurate, for those who disagree with the *Danvers Statement* and may have more agreement with the "Evangelical Feminism" to which it seeks to

respond would strongly affirm exactly the same point - that men and women are not identical, and were created to relate within a complementary partnership.⁴

15. This review serves to demonstrate how the issue of terminology reflects something of the differences and confusion concerning the issue of women's ministry. We therefore propose to proceed with the specific titles "the case against women's ordination to the priesthood", and "the case in favour of women's ordination to the priesthood", without wanting to lock adherents of the former position into an entirely negative stance, and recognising that both cases draw on wider streams of interpretation reflected in the survey of titles above.

The Biblical material: exegetical and preliminary hermeneutical observations.

Genesis 1

16. There is little dispute concerning Genesis 1. Within the literary structure which depicts the totality of creation, humanity, both male and female, was created as the climax of God's creative activity. Males and females are created in the image and likeness of God. Whilst the exact nuances of these terms are in some dispute, the general tenor is clear. The terms indicate both something of the *function* that God had in mind for men and women, and something about the *being* or *nature* of humanity as made by God. Males and females have been created to exercise responsible dominion over the world, and are created in God's likeness to enable them to fulfil this mandate.

Genesis 2

17. There are a number of areas of dispute concerning the interpretation of Genesis 2. These are significant because the alternative patterns perceived in Genesis 2 often serve as paradigms for an overall understanding of male/female relationships as intended by God. On either view, whilst the passage does not give any specific elaboration or demarcation of roles between males and females, it does focus on relationships.

18. The passage provides a second account of creation from another perspective. It focuses particularly on the relationships between God, Adam, the woman and the animals. Structurally, Genesis 2 is both a literary unit in its own right, having its own narrative concern and climax, as well as being part of a wider literary unit with chapter 3. The overall structure has been classified as synchronic or palistropic⁵, that is, it falls into two sections (2:5-25 and 3:1-24) which balance each other in an inverted relationship, like a mirror image. The narrative operates through a series of scenes designed to counter-balance each other.

19. This structure does appear to reflect a hierarchy of relationships. The question is, how is the hierarchy to be identified? There are two main possibilities:

	The "male leadership established in creation" view	The "equal partners in leadership" view
Genesis 2	One: God men women animals	Two: God men & women in partnership animals

The "equal partners in leadership" view:

20. This line of interpretation emphasises the creation of the woman as a partner corresponding to Adam. The key verse in the unit is 2:18. The phrase "it is not good..." stands in contrast to the climactic statements at the end of each stage of creation in chapter 1. At this point in the narrative, the work of creation is incomplete and unsatisfactory. The man working by himself is unable to fulfil the mandate given to him by God (v.15), and as the search amongst the animals establishes, no other living creature is suitable.

21. On this view, the notion of subordination cannot be based in the use of the word for "helper", *ezer*, alone. The word is used more often than not of Yahweh who comes to the aid of Israel in the Old Testament. A superior being is quite able to come to the aid of a subordinate. The term "helper" does not imply any place within a hierarchical ranking. It simply indicates that the person requiring help is lacking in adequate strength or resources to cope with the situation at hand. The status of the woman, in regard to the man, is provided by the qualifier to "helper"; that is, she "corresponds" to him, she is his counterpart. This is a difficult phrase to render (lit. "as in front of him"), but carries the notion of complementarity. Taken together, the terms envisage a partnership in complementary balance.⁶ Because the search for this partner forms the central focus of the narrative, with the picture of the secure and harmonious "one flesh" partnership at the end of the

chapter clearly depicted as the desired state of affairs, it is argued that this should govern our understanding of any hierarchy in view. Thus option 2 reflects this understanding.

22. The chronological order is not as significant as it may seem. In chapter 1, the order of the days is more thematic than strictly chronological. Within the narrative of chapter 2, the animals are created before the woman, but certainly no superiority over the woman can be claimed on that basis. The point of the narrative structure is to highlight the creation of the woman as the climax of God's creative activity, something which resolved the unsatisfactory state of affairs before her creation. If anything, the climactic position of the woman's creation, coming last in the narrative, focuses on her importance and indispensability. Only complete humanity as male and female can fulfil God's command. The New Testament passages which refer to the chronological order of creation need to be understood within their own context (see relevant sections below).

23. Similarly, to understand the significance of Adam naming the woman, it has to be seen within the context of the narrative development. In regard to the animals, the naming serves to indicate that none of the animals is the sought after partner. When Adam addressed the woman, it was not so much the act of naming that is significant, but the description itself, indicating that his corresponding partner had been found: "this is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh" etc. "The exclamation of Gen 2:23 is a cry of discovery, of recognition...it is an act of discernment rather than an act of domination."⁷ It is not until after the disobedience and its consequent fracturing of harmonious partnership that Adam named Eve in a personal manner (Gen 3:20).

The "male leadership established in creation" view:

24. There are a number of reasons put forward to support this view. Firstly, and perhaps most powerful, is the fact that the passage is androcentric; that is, it clearly reflects the assumption that the male figure is the central character.⁸ He is created first. God speaks to him directly. It is from his bones that the woman is created. The woman is seen to occupy a subordinate place within the plot. It is the man who does the searching, who names the animals, and who names the woman. It is the man who takes the initiative in leaving his father and mother, and who takes a wife (v.24). It would not be possible to exchange the male and female characters within the narrative without significantly changing the perspective.⁹

25. Secondly, the activity of naming the woman by Adam is said to be a sign of authority and mastery. As G von Rad notes, "Name-giving in the ancient Orient was primarily an exercise of sovereignty, of command".¹⁰ The fact that it is the man who names the woman indicates that although they are on an equal footing as regards their humanity, the woman is expected to be subordinate to the man.¹¹

26. The attempt by some commentators to argue that this activity was not strictly speaking "naming" because (unlike the instances of naming the animals) neither the noun nor the verb for "name" is used, but only the more general "to call" (*qara*),¹² can be dismissed on the grounds that there are instances elsewhere in Genesis (16:14; 31:47) where the author used the verb "to call" in the sense of "to name" without the addition the noun "name". Furthermore, the assertion that "woman" (*ishah*) is not a name as such but only a common noun is similarly invalidated by the observation that we are not told what Adam called the animals, and in any case such names would most likely also have been common nouns or generic terms.¹³

27. Thirdly, the woman is created as a "helper", an *ezer*. It is argued that this implies that the principal task belongs to the male, and that the role of the woman as helper is to assist the man. The person who comes to the aid of someone else may or may not be superior or inferior, but the fact remains that the main responsibility is given to the person who is given the task, and that the helper is in a secondary or subordinate position.¹⁴ It is the man who is taken from the ground and commanded to till it and keep it (2:15).

28. The phrase "corresponding to him" (2:18) says nothing about equality of relationship as such but refers more specifically to being one of the same species.¹⁵ The woman corresponds to Adam in a way the animals do not, as someone who shares his human identity.

29. Finally, in Gen. 2:18-25 the relationship between men and women is portrayed through a combination of narrative and dialogue. The presentation is such that an ordered relationship is indicated whereby the chronological priority of the man is significant. This is indicated initially through the carefully structured narrative (2:4b - 3:24) and the way in which the principal characters interact. In abbreviated form,¹⁶ the seven scenes involve:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. 2:4-17: God (active), man (passive) | 7 3:22-24: God (active), man (passive) |
| 2. 2:18-25: God (active), man (subordinate), woman & animals (both passive) | 6. 14-21 God (active), snake, woman, (both passive) & the man (subordinate). |
| 3. 3:1-5 Snake & woman | 5. 3:9-13 God, man and woman |
| 4. 3:6-8 Woman & man | |

30. The structure of the passage reflects something of the ordering of relationships. God initiates all the action in Genesis 2. He has established an order within relationships - God, man, woman, animals. This is not an order of superiority but a "hierarchy of responsibility".¹⁷ Man is given particular responsibilities (till the earth, name the animals), and is to be responsible for his partner, the woman he names.¹⁸ Both men and women are to be responsible stewards, exercising dominion under God over the rest of animals and the rest of the created order.

31. This understanding of the significance of the chronological order within Genesis as implying a pre-fall creational pattern whereby women are to be subordinate to men is reinforced by the New Testament's treatment of Genesis 2.¹⁹ For Paul, the chronological order clearly is significant and is related to man being recognised as head over the woman (1 Cor. 11:8,9) and to women being in full submission to men, not teaching or having authority over them (1 Tim. 2:11-13). Some suggest that the reference to the "Law" in 1 Cor. 14:34 is best understood as an allusion to Genesis 2, justifying the command for women to be in submission.

Genesis 3

32. There is little disagreement concerning Genesis 3. Walsh draws attention to the apparent reversal of roles in the passage: the man listens to his wife instead of God, the woman to an animal (the serpent). There is undeniably an inversion of roles, especially between God and the serpent. Adam attempted to place the blame upon the woman, and as a consequence, upon God for having provided the woman (3:12). In verse 17 God holds Adam responsible for his actions, stating that he chose to follow his wife. Eve stated that the result of her deception by the serpent was that she "ate" (3:13). There is no direct statement that Eve was deceived into assuming authority or a role that she should not, except in her desire to be like God. Again, how you understand the reversal of relationships will depend upon how Genesis 2 is interpreted (as indicated in the charts below), but the matter is of less consequence. Responsibility for the disobedience is laid on both Adam and the woman.

Genesis 3	Animal (serpent)	Animal (serpent)
	women	men & women in conflict
	men	God
	God	

33. Clines suggests that the nature of God's punishments reflects the special spheres of responsibility due to Adam and the woman: Adam to till the fields; the woman to bear children.²⁰ If this is so, it is no more than one very generalised aspect of responsibility, and should not be considered as exclusive or universal.

34. Verse 16 is variously interpreted, but it certainly involves desire on the part of the woman for her husband in some sense, either desire for him sexually or emotionally, or, following Susan Foh, her desire may be to dominate her husband.²¹ Either way, God anticipates that the relationship between male and female will be characterised by male domination. This outcome of the disobedience to God is clearly negative. The harmonious "one flesh" partnership pictured as the climax of chapter 2 has been replaced by a struggle for power and a conflicting determination to dominate. These verses attributed to God are more anticipatory or predictive on God's part, rather than an expression of how he wants things to be. They are descriptive rather than prescriptive.²²

The Old Testament - A Brief Reflection:

35. It is not within our purposes to analyse the general Old Testament picture. There are many negative examples of the ill-treatment of women and patriarchal practice;²³ there are also some outstanding cases of women being accepted in positions of leadership and responsibility. Deborah (Judg. 4) was a "judge" (better "leader") and prophetess, and although she did not lead the army as did other judges, under God's authority she issued commands and directives to Barak, the commander of the army, as her subordinate. Huldah (2 Kings 22:14-20) was recognised by King Josiah and Hilkiyah the priest as a true prophetess of God.

36. Whilst women were often regarded as being amongst the powerless of society (widows especially are listed alongside orphans as being objects of God's special concern), the covenant law code reflects a particular concern for their well-being and protection from abuse. Within parts of both the Old Testament and Jewish traditions, women were valued and respected by the godly and wise (eg. the wife of Proverbs 31).

Jesus and women.

37. Space forbids a detailed examination of Jesus' teaching and attitude toward women. The evidence in the Gospels concerning women's roles or ministries is indirect. It is clear that Jesus strongly affirmed women as legitimate disciples, and that he encouraged them to learn at his feet. Women had a special ministry to Christ in supporting his ministry (Luke 8:1-3), and he was unashamed to be in contact and associated with them, regardless of their reputations (Luke 7:36-50). The witness of the Samaritan woman at the well (John

4) was instrumental in many from her town believing in Christ (John 4:39-42). Several of the women were at the foot of the cross, and were the first to witness the resurrected Christ. However, it cannot be established that Jesus set about a clear mission to overthrow the role of women within the culture of his day. Similarly, the fact that Christ chose twelve circumcised males as apostles may reflect the realities of the culture of his day whereby women were not legally recognised witnesses. All such considerations are speculative. It can be suggested from the evidence that the cultural milieu was generally negative and this is to be contrasted with the positive affirming attitude displayed by Jesus in the Gospel accounts. This brief note reflects the belief that there is little clear material in the Gospels which have direct bearing on the issue at hand, although we recognise that more could be said.

Women within the life of the early church.

38. There is significant evidence that women were much involved in various aspects of ministry within the early church. The most natural way to understand the name Junia (Rom.16:7) is that she was a female apostle. Although it is conceivable the name is an abbreviated form of a male name, there is no trace amongst ancient epigraphic evidence of this name ever referring to a male.²⁴ She was not, however, one of the apostles commissioned personally by Christ, but an apostle in the broader sense, probably as either an itinerant missionary involved in proclaiming the gospel or church envoy. It is worthy of note, however, that together with Andronicus (her husband?) she was in the opinion of St. Paul "outstanding".

39. Also listed in Romans 16 are a number of women who are commended for having "worked hard" (Mary, v. 6; Tryphena and Tryphosa, v.12a; Persis, v.12b). This is Paul's special term reserved for those who are engaged in gospel ministry, most likely missionary or evangelistic activity.²⁵ Similarly, Euodia and Syntyche are described as having contended for the gospel (Phil 4:2-3). The four daughters of Philip are noted as having prophesied (Acts 21:9). Lydia (Acts 16:15,40) and Nympha (Col 4:15) certainly had churches meet in their homes.

40. The fact that Priscilla's name occurs most often before her husband, Aquila (Rom 16:3; Acts 18:18, 26; 2 Tim 4:19; cf. Acts 18:2; 1 Cor 16:19), has occasioned comment. Although this may be due to social convention (Prisca coming from a noble family?), it is equally likely to be a reflection of the high regard Paul had for her personal ministry, which, together with Aquila, we know to have included instruction (Acts 18:26) and the hosting of a home church (1 Cor 16:19).

41. Finally Phoebe, sometimes erroneously described as a "good friend" (GNB), was both a deacon (either in the formal sense of holding a recognised position or in the informal sense of minister) and a *prostasis*. It is overstating the case to translate this term as leader (although the related term in 1 Thess 5:12 and 1 Tim 3:4,5 should be understood that way). More likely, the term indicates that she used her social position, wealth and apparent independence to function as a patron for Paul, possibly as a host of a house church.²⁶

42. In summary, there is no specific mention or indication of women as either presbyters or overseers. There is, however, some evidence of a woman as an apostle (of the more general category), and of women who prophesied, and some who taught in certain circumstances. There is also some evidence for women as deacons, and reference to some women who had churches meet in their home.

Galatians 3: 28.

Agreement:

43. There is no doubt that this is a most significant statement by Paul. It comes as a climactic conclusion to his detailed argument throughout chapter 3. The statement concerning the equal standing of Jew and Gentile within God's covenant people, both parties being legitimate heirs in Christ to the gospel promise, comes as no great surprise. It is the point towards which Paul had very clearly been moving. The inclusion of the other two pairs (slave and free; male and female) included in this statement of unity in Christ is unexpected. There had been no mention in the preceding argument concerning these groupings. Clearly, Paul considered the need to include these additional social groupings within this statement because they likewise share a remarkable equal standing as co-heirs in Christ. Something of the unified status of Jew and Gentile is shared by slave and free, male and female.

44. This statement does not mean that all distinctions between the above groupings are abolished. It does, however, clearly indicate that a radical joint and equal standing is established. Yet equal in what respect? All agree that before God, as children of the covenant, there is no discrimination on the basis of race, gender, or social status as co-heirs of the promise of salvation. Does this "vertical" dimension of equal standing have any horizontal expression? How should this unity be expressed within the fellowship of the church? Clearly some distinction remains within the ordering of the church. Children may be co-heirs, but that does not mean that they should be eligible for every role within the church.

45. Those who argue against the ordination of women to the priesthood generally hold that this statement by Paul is essentially a theological statement concerning unity within God's covenant people. This verse does not have significant social dimensions, because distinctions between men and women still remain, and Paul and Peter can address specific comments to both men and women for them to behave in a distinctive manner. Those who are in favour of the ordination of women to the priesthood would want to take the social expression of this unity further.

The case in favour of women's ordination to the priesthood: the social expression of Gal 3: 28.

46. Paul clearly had in mind the way in which the joint status of Jews and Gentiles within the covenant was expressed socially. Indeed, Paul introduced the whole issue by citing the example of his confrontation with Peter at Antioch, which came about because the equal standing of the Gentiles along with the Jews (which Peter accepted) was not being recognised socially (Gal 2: 11-21). Hence, Paul accused Peter of hypocrisy (2:13), believing one thing but acting socially in a way which was not in line with the truth of the gospel (2:14). For Paul, theological truth must have appropriate social expression. His conclusion in Gal 3:28 is his answer to the social inconsistency he perceived in Antioch.

47. It follows from this, that by pairing slave and free, male and female with Jew and Gentile, Paul is calling for the theological unity and equal standing within the covenant, shared by all these groupings, to be reflected in the social order within the fellowship of the church. Paul obviously is not calling for Christians to pretend to be a type of unisex group. However, it is argued that it is not unreasonable to conclude that he is stating that Gentiles, slaves and women are not to be discriminated against within the fellowship of the church on the basis of their race, gender or social status.

48. In regard to various areas of ministry, the acceptance by the church of positions such as leaders or teachers is determined by a number of factors - is the person motivated by a desire to honour God and edify the church? do they show evidence that they have been gifted by God for that particular ministry? and so on. The issue is, to what degree should being female disqualify someone from various aspects of ministry, simply on the basis of gender, especially when there is clear evidence of God having spiritually gifted some women for these ministries, and where it can be seen that such ministries would edify the church?

49. It is therefore argued by those favouring the ordination of women to the priesthood that it is quite appropriate to draw on Gal 3:28 in this regard, and to suggest that the male/female gender distinction alone is an illegitimate category for restricting the ministry of women within the fellowship of the church.

The case against the ordination of women to the priesthood:

50. Proponents of this view believe that the case outlined above reads too much into the text. Paul clearly *did* differentiate on occasions between men and women regarding the appropriateness of women undertaking some aspect of ministry (eg. 1 Tim. 2). Men and women may have equal standing within the covenant people, but they are still different, and such differences may be reflected in differing responsibilities without compromising their unity in Christ. This is a point on which many in favour of women's ordination to the priesthood also concur. As a recent writer has put it:

"we may say that for Paul it was axiomatic that male-female distinctions in respect of believers' standing before God had been removed in Christ...However, Paul expected the distinctions in male-female relationships to be reflected in the way women behaved in the Christian assembly, even as they expressed their new found freedom in Christ, and laboured alongside men as colleagues in the cause of the gospel. All this was argued on theological grounds, and was not merely seen as a matter of expediency."²⁷

1 Corinthians 11: 2-16.50.

51. There are several points of agreement concerning this passage. The passage is directed at both men and women, and Paul makes no role distinction between men and women in these verses. *Both* men and women are noted as praying and prophesying. It is not a question (in this passage at least) about *what* ministry women are involved in, but the *manner* in which they were conducting themselves, as it is for men.

52. The passage concerns the manner in which both men and women adorn their heads whilst praying and prophesying. The "praying and prophesying" referred to may reflect two particular activities engaged within church and no more, or it may be a shorthand phrase for all the types of ministries conducted within a church context. It is agreed that Paul is concerned to maintain the distinctiveness of the sexes. The way in which coiffure was regarded as an important reflection and symbol of sexual distinctiveness in the world of St Paul may be illustrated by a quotation from the Stoic philosopher, Epictetus (c. AD 55 - 135):

"Can anything be more useless than the hairs on the chin? But has not nature used even these in the most suitable way possible? Has she not by these means distinguished between the male and female? Does not the nature of each one among us cry aloud from afar, 'I am a man, approach me and talk to me on this understanding, don't ask for proof, for here are the signs.'?"

Points of agreement:

55. Apart from the different conclusions concerning the significance of *kephale* in verse 3, there is not a lot in dispute concerning this passage. Most would agree that Paul's concern is that the distinctiveness of males and females be reflected by appropriate dress. Men were not to adorn themselves with veils, and women were not to adorn themselves as men. No clear evidence has emerged which has demonstrated exactly how head-dress indicated any sort of subordination.³³

The case in favour of the ordination of women to the priesthood:

56. The thrust of verses 4-6 is that men and women should dress appropriately to reflect their distinctiveness as males and females. The authority which the woman wears in verse 10 should be understood as the woman's own authority, for that is the way that term is used elsewhere in Paul. The woman does not need to dress as a de facto male because she has her own authority to minister in her own right as a woman. Verses 8 and 9 are structurally balanced by verses 11 and 12 (which are misleadingly placed in brackets in the RSV, as if they were an aside of no consequence). The significance of the fact that women were created *from men* is now qualified by the observation of the truth that men also come *from women*. Overall, the weight of the passage is in verse 11. Paul pictures a partnership characterised by mutual interdependence. Therefore, it may be suggested that in this context, with its emphasis on words like "through" or "out of" and "from", the rendering of *kephale* as "source" in verse 3 makes good contextual sense. God may be understood as the source of the incarnate Christ, the one who sent Christ into the world.³⁴

57. It may be claimed, therefore, that this passage is not of great significance to the ordination issue. Paul's emphasis is on mutual inter-dependence between men and women. He does not indicate any specific restriction on the roles or ministries undertaken by women in this passage. His concern is *how* both women and men present themselves whilst they are ministering.

The case against the ordination of women to the priesthood:

58. This view emphasises the created order of men and women as the basis of Paul's argument. This is seen in the christological analysis of the second creation narrative in verse 3 and reflected in verses 8 and 9. The significance of the manner of head-dress concerned the importance of reflecting this created order. The authority upon the women's head (v.10) is understood by some as a sign of her husband's authority. Others think it is the authority of the woman as a *woman* to act within the created order, perhaps concerning her relationship with the angels over whom she will sit in judgement with the rest of redeemed humanity. The attire worn by women (or wives) should recognize and reflect the headship of men (or husbands). It is not a mark of inferiority but of obedience directly owed to God. To reverse or negate the created roles assigned to humanity is to act against the nature of salvation. God does not save persons as asexual beings but men and women; that is, he saves what he created.

59. The stress given to verses 11 and 12 by those in favour of women's ordination to the priesthood (whereby the significance of woman having been created from man (v.8) is said to be qualified by the observation that men now come from women) destroys the thrust of the passage. This is especially so if *kephale* is understood as source, for it would result in the conclusion that a woman is now a source/head of man to the same degree that man is a source/head of woman. There is something significant and irrevocable in the statement that the head of the woman is her husband just as there is in the statement that the head of Christ is God. Headship is not a symmetrical relationship. Furthermore, it is argued that understanding *kephale* as source does not make good sense in this context when applied to the relationship between Christ and God. In what sense is God the "source" of Christ?

60. The well-attested meaning of *kephale* as "authority over"³⁵ provides a more straightforward line of interpretation for this passage. Just as Christ voluntarily subordinated himself to the Father (eg. 1 Cor. 15:23-28), so too men are to subordinate themselves to Christ and women are to accept the authority of men over them. Such headship is a responsibility to be exercised for the well-being of the other.

1 Corinthians 14: 33 - 35

61. On any view, this passage cannot be understood as being as absolute as it first seems. If Scripture is to be regarded as consistent, the silence enjoined on women must relate to specific circumstances, for just two chapters prior to this passage, Paul had confirmed that (at the least), women were free to pray and prophesy within a church context. There are two main lines of interpretation, both of which seek to understand these instructions in context.

The case against the ordination of women to the priesthood - a restriction upon women exercising authoritative evaluation of prophecy:

62. Given that Paul allowed women to pray and prophesy, there must be some indication in the previous verses as to the specific circumstances in which they were to remain silent. The immediate topic in hand

concerns the control of those wanting to prophesy in Church, and especially the weighing up of what had been said (v.29). This view would argue that prophecy is not an act of authoritative teaching, for prophecy is subject to evaluation. The nature of prophecy is revelatory, and does not involve mediation through the mind and will of the prophet. Consequently, it is regarded as not being ecstatic in that it is supra-rational, but involves the direct repeating of the divine word. Women may therefore prophesy, but not teach, nor evaluate prophecy from the stance of an authoritative teacher.³⁶ This interpretation takes account of the overall flow of the unit, for Paul returns to the question of the evaluation of prophecy in verses 39-40. Understood this way, there is no need to explain why Paul suddenly jumps from one topic (the evaluation of prophecy) to another (women speaking in church), for the latter is an example of the former.³⁷

63. Therefore, the reference to the "Law" (v.34) must be to Genesis 2 - not to any specific verse but to the hierarchical pattern of authority and subordination on the part of women suggested there. This practice is not considered as merely local to Corinth. Paul appealed both to his own practice as an apostle of Christ, and to the universal mind of the churches. The gospel did not begin in Corinth, and they needed to take to heart the practice "as in all the congregations of the saints" (v.33b).

64. The view that Paul's instructions in this passage are to be understood as reflecting social concerns within first century culture does not explain why women are singled out for instruction. Surely Paul would have been equally concerned about men asking inappropriate questions. The rationale underlying Paul's instruction is theological. The call for women to be silent and submissive is based on an appeal to "the Law", a term which is primarily used by Paul in reference to the Old Testament Torah (cf. Rom. 3:19; 1 Cor. 9:8).³⁸ As D A Carson writes:

"The passage from Genesis 2 does not enjoin silence, but it suggests that because man was made first and woman was made for man, a pattern has been laid down regarding the roles the two play. Paul understands from this creation order that woman is to be subject to man -or at least that wife is subject to husband. In the context of the Corinthian weighing of prophecies, such submission could not be preserved if the wives participated: the first husband who uttered a prophecy would precipitate the problem."³⁹

The case in favour of the ordination of women to the priesthood:

65. The suggestion above is not accepted by those in favour of women's ordination to the priesthood. Both prophecy *and teaching* are subject to evaluation. The authority of both is derivative - from God. Whilst Scripture is the Church's authoritative God-given measure of truth, teaching does not have the same claim to authority as Scripture itself. It is argued that prophecy, on any definition, is authoritative to some degree.⁴⁰ It is listed as second only to apostleship in 1 Cor. 12:28. To distinguish between teaching as authoritative and prophecy as having no authority is considered theologically erroneous. Furthermore, the passage does not actually say that women were not to be involved in evaluating prophecy, and if this was Paul's point, we would expect him to clearly state it. The reference to "the Law" is elusive. No Old Testament passage enjoins women to be silent, and it may be argued that Genesis 2 does not differentiate between women and men on a hierarchical structure of authority.

66. There is another way to understand this passage within its specific context. The overall concern of the wider unit (14:26-40) is for orderly worship. The underlying theological principle is provided in 14:33a -our worship is to be orderly because our God is not a God of disorder but of peace. The nature of our worship and assembly is to reflect the nature of our God. Three times within this unit Paul instructs one particular group to be silent: the person speaking in tongues when there is no interpreter (v28); the person prophesying when someone else receives a revelation (v.30); and the women in verse 34. In each case, the same word for "be silent" is used. In each case, the relevant person or group are called to silence because they are contributing to disorder.

67. The nature of the disorderly behaviour of some of the women, and the specific way in which the injunction to be silent may be understood, is made clear by verse 35. The way in which some women were *asking questions* was bringing disgrace upon the church. The reason for this perception of disgrace can be clarified by an understanding of social expectations of that culture. Compare the picture in Livy (34.2.; 1st. Century B.C.), recreating a speech of M. Porcius Cato:

"If each man of us, fellow citizens, had established that the right and authority of the husband should be held over the mother of his own family, we should have less difficulty over women in general; now at home our freedom is conquered by female fury, here in the forum it is bruised and trampled upon...

What kind of behaviour is this?

Running around in public, blocking streets, and speaking to other women's husbands! Could you not have asked your husband the same thing at home?"

68. This is not to suggest that Paul is endorsing such views. But the parallel is striking, and indicates that Paul considered what was happening in Corinth to be disgraceful because social conventions were being flouted, resulting in disorder, which reflected poorly on God who is not a God of disorder but of peace. This line of interpretation picks up both the general concern for orderly worship evident throughout the unit (evidenced by the instruction for those contributing to disorder to be silent), and the specific reference to the asking of questions in verse 35. The disgrace in view in verse 35 does not concern *any* occurrence of a woman speaking in church, but is specifically related to the *type* of speaking in view in the first half of the verse - the asking of questions in an inappropriate manner in terms of first century decorum, bringing disgrace upon the Church.

1 Timothy 2:11-15.

69. It is generally recognised that the interpretation of this passage gets to the crux of the issue at hand. Apart from specific differences in detail, the key point of issue is summarised in the following quote:

"The issue at stake is: are Paul's words of local and of historically limited application...or of universal application...To accept the former view one has to establish from the Pastorals a suitable scenario to justify Paul's prohibition..."⁴¹

70. Whilst it is certainly true that the Pastoral Epistles were intended to be read by a wider circle than just their original recipients, it is equally clear that they were written to address particular situations within an understood sphere of circumstances. Thus, whilst the Pastoral Epistles contain many statements of universal and timeless truths (especially the 'this is a trustworthy saying...' affirmations), they also contain a number of statements directed to specific issues. Such are still part of Scripture, but their application into our circumstances may not be direct.

71. An obvious example of the latter is 1 Timothy 5:23: "No longer drink only water, but use a little wine for the sake of your stomach and your frequent ailments." Clearly 1 Timothy 5:9 concerning compiling a list of widows also falls within this category of statements directed to specific issues.

72. The instructions concerning women contain both general and timeless principles, and particular directions about how such principles are to be expressed within the specific circumstances in Ephesus. Note, for example, the general truths concerning dress in 1 Timothy 2:9: "women should adorn themselves modestly and sensibly in seemly apparel"; and the specific directions which, arguably, few would regard as literally appropriate today: women were not to dress with "braided hair or gold or pearls or costly attire". The issue is not so much "did Paul forbid women in the Ephesian church from teaching or exercising authority/domineering over men", but "did Paul intend such instructions to be for all times and all places"?

The context of 1 Timothy 2:72.

73. The trend of recent studies has been to appreciate more fully the circumstances which gave rise to Paul's writing of 1 and 2 Timothy.⁴² As was his custom, Paul declared his purpose in writing after his initial greeting. He was writing to Timothy to urge him to combat the outbreak of false teaching in Ephesus (1 Tim.1:3-4). Much of the material contained in 1 and 2 Timothy constitutes strategic advice from Paul to Timothy as to how to respond to the controversial false teaching, and the priorities to be adopted within Timothy's own ministry, as well as instructions to be followed by the Ephesian church. This reading of the context of 1 Timothy in particular is confirmed by a number of observations. The letter ends on the same note as Timothy is exhorted to guard what has been entrusted to his care, and to "turn away from what is falsely called knowledge" (6:20,21).

74. At the conclusion of 1 Timothy 1, Paul again returns to this theme in urging Timothy to fight the good fight, that is, *against the false teachers*, as is made clear by the following verse (1:18-20). 1 Timothy 2 commences by reinforcing this concern to combat false teaching. Both the "therefore" and the "first of all" clearly signal that Paul is placing his comments in chapter 2 within the context of his declared concerns of chapter 1. The instructions in chapter 2 are Paul's directions as to how Timothy is to fight the good fight against the false teachers. His first concern is to pray for peace, so that the gospel may be both lived and proclaimed unhindered.

75. It is one thing to acknowledge that a body of instructions is given to a specific situation. It is quite another to determine exactly the nature of the teaching or the situation underlying specific statements. Evangelical expositors differ in their conclusions over these issues, and over which statements are timeless and universal, and which are of limited application beyond their immediate context.

Exegetical issues:

What may be determined from "epitrepo" ("I am not permitting")?

76. The verb translated in the NIV "I do not permit" ("*epitrepo*") is in the present tense. This does not necessarily imply a universal and timeless instruction, although it is possible to read it in such a way. However, it is also legitimate to render it as "I am not permitting", with possibly an implied nuance of "in

these circumstances". Grammar alone cannot determine the issue, and it is probably best to translate the term as "I am not permitting", which leaves open the issue as to whether it is timeless and on-going or circumstantial and short-term.

Are women generally or wives specifically in view?

77. It has been suggested by some scholars that Paul had primarily wives in view in his instructions in this passage. The word "gyne" may mean either "women" or "wife" in Greek. The matter has to be decided from context. P W Barnett has suggested that Paul had wives in mind, as the statements in 2:15 reflect such a context. The majority view, however, is that women generally are intended. The matter is only really of consequence when considering the hermeneutical issue - to whom does it apply? Expositors both for and against women's ordination to the priesthood can be found who take either position.

What is the strength of the terms "in quietness" and "in all submission"?

78. The term often translated "silence" ("*hesuchia*") is different to the verb used in 1 Cor. 14:33. The same verb occurs earlier in the passage in 2:2. It occurs in both 2:11 and 12, and all three should be rendered "quietness". The word is used consistently by Paul in contexts (1 Thess. 4:11; 2 Thess. 3:12) where the connotation is of not causing a disruption or disturbance rather than the idea of total silence.

79. Verses 11 and 12 have both a chiasmic (crisscross pattern) and parallel structure (ABCBCA):

A - a woman in QUIETNESS

B - is to LEARN

C - in all SUBMISSION

BI - is not to TEACH

CI - nor to *authentain* over men

AI - she is to be QUIET

80. The strength of "in all submission" is more controversial. That the language is emphatic is undeniable. The term relates to accepting the authority of someone, and here probably means to recognise the legitimacy of the teacher's authority. The term also carries the broader notion of respecting the place of someone else. Christians are called to submit to one another (Eph. 5:21).⁴³ This is more than just serving one another; it is closely related to humbling ourselves (Phil. 2:3), and in the Christian context means recognising and accepting God's ordering of ministry throughout the whole body of the Church. Women were being exhorted to learn without causing disturbances, accepting the teaching they were receiving in Ephesus, so long as it was faithful to the received gospel traditions (cf. 1 Tim.6:3-5).

The case against the ordination of women to the priesthood:

81. Some of those in opposition of the ordination of women to the priesthood would go further, and argue that the submission in view is specifically to men (or husbands). This perspective is based on the suggestion that "submission" is balanced in these verses by "not to exercise authority over men", which it is argued is the key principle underlying this passage. This is seen from the chiasmic structure of verse 11 and 12. The phrases balance and mutually reinforce each other. "To be subordinate" is to submit to authority, and such authority is said to be not for women. Thus it is seen as an expression of authoritative headship by men over women. The passage regulates the verbal participation of women in the congregation. That they may pray, and should, is clear from verse 9, but to undertake the exposition of the apostolic faith in the assembly would involve a reversal of the creation and thus negate the character of God's activity.

The case in favour of the ordination of women to the priesthood:

82. The headship view above is rejected by those in favour of women's ordination. Introducing the notion of headship is regarded as a clear importation into the text, for headship terminology is absent. The reference to submission makes good sense in the context of accepting the teaching ministry at Ephesus, and the reference to *authentain* over men is better understood not as straightforward authority, but domination over men (see below).

How broadly is "to teach" to be understood?

83. There is no specific qualification as to what type of teaching Paul was forbidding women. It is possible to understand it to mean that in these circumstances where the false teachers had created such havoc, all types of teaching (including to other women and children) was being forbidden. For if the problem was that women were passing on teaching they had been deceived into accepting, then obviously they should not be allowed to pass on such views. Some find a problem with this interpretation (women being forbidden to teach to prevent the furthering of errant teaching) because the false teachers were men, and argue that such men were still in the congregation. However, others argue that by this stage such false teachers were no-longer part of the congregation, and that Paul's concern was with order within the church, and therefore focused on the women (still part of the church) who had been influenced by the errant teachers.

84. It is clear that the New Testament churches did not know of pulpit teaching as such, and any attempt to resolve the import of these verses by distinguishing between speaking from within a pulpit or outside a pulpit; or from distinguishing between formal "sermons" and informal teaching is in danger of anachronistic exegesis.

85. Some try to relate the teaching in view to the word *authentēin*: it is teaching "with authority" which is specifically in view. Following this, those opposing the ordination of women to the priesthood argue that Paul is forbidding women to occupy the office of the teacher, that is, the presbyter.⁴⁴ Those who argue for the ordination of women to the priesthood point out in opposition to this that not all presbyters teach (the implication of 5:17), and that Paul's choice of words reflect that he was forbidding (in these circumstances, not necessarily for all time) a *general activity* rather than a *specific position*.⁴⁵ Much depends on how *authentēin* is understood, and whether or not one accepts a theological distinction between official and unofficial teaching.

What does "authentēin" mean?

86. This word is one of the key exegetical cruxes in understanding this passage, and it is one of the areas where there has been significant scholarly development in how we are able to understand the word, although there is still scope for disagreement. This is the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament, and it is not the usual term for authority, which is generally *exousia*.

87. The conclusion often referred to by G W Knight III that *authentēo* simply meant "to have authority over", without any "negative connotation"⁴⁶ is now open to serious review. Leland Wilshire⁴⁷ has produced ample evidence to establish that the word had a multiplicity of meanings, including "to murder". The conclusion to Wilshire's study is open ended: the word was essentially negative, but over time came to take on the additional meanings of "to exercise authority/power/rights" which became firmly established in the Greek Patristic writers to mean "to have authority".⁴⁸

88. Originally (in the Hellenistic period), the word meant to do something by one's own hand or through one's own power; hence it could mean "to murder", "to commit suicide" or "to instigate violence",⁴⁹ and it came to refer also to the broader concept of criminal behaviour. After the New Testament period, the term underwent significant semantic specialisation as it became increasingly adopted as an ecclesiastical term for authority. However, the later ecclesiastical usage should not determine its meaning in the New Testament period (just as we would not refer to the Church Fathers to understand how the term *episkopos* "bishop" should be understood in the New Testament).

89. The word appears to convey the notion of power "to act decisively", "to hold sway or control". Louw and Nida understand the meaning to be "to control in a domineering manner."⁵⁰

The case in favour of the ordination of women to the priesthood:

90. This perspective would emphasise the semantic evidence that *authentēo* is not a straight forward word for authority. Rather, it consistently carries the nuances of power to dominate, to hold sway, even to domineer. This nuance would fit neatly into the context of 1 Timothy 2:12 as "I am not permitting a woman to teach nor to domineer over men". Taking note of the chiasm and parallelism in verses 11 and 12, *authentēin*, "to domineer", is the failure to be subordinate (ie. respect, recognise and humble oneself before legitimate ministries). This may be a reflection of the type of disturbances Paul was seeking to control, and may have resulted from accepting some of the false teachers views. It is known that the false teachers caused significant tension within households and marriages and that they specifically targeted women (2 Tim. 3:6-7).

91. Those in favour of women's ordination (and some of those opposed) would argue against distinguishing between official and unofficial teaching. When priests stand in a pulpit and preach, they have no more authority as a teacher than a deacon or a lay person. Their authority rests on their faithfulness to God's Word, and the Spirit's equipping of them for the ministry of teaching. It may be argued that priests have greater influence because their official status implies recognition within the Church, but this begs the question. It is a matter of legitimate authority rather than potential to influence. Ecclesiastical authority recognises but does not add to the authority that comes from the exercise of a spiritual gift. Official recognition may heighten recognition by others of the teacher's legitimacy, but it does not add to it, and if it is perceived that a particular teaching is in error, one's conscience is not bound to accept it by virtue of the office the teacher may hold.

92. This view therefore holds that it is theologically erroneous to distinguish between official and unofficial teaching. The New Testament speaks rather of faithful and legitimate teaching, and false teaching. Either a teaching is true, or it is not. Furthermore, how can the distinction between official and unofficial be made? How can it be said that a woman may exercise her teaching gifts informally, but that she is not to be officially recognised or used in formal contexts? What constitutes a formal context? The suggestions outlined in "case against" are considered somewhat artificial and erroneously construed.

93. Teaching, like prophecy, was also subject to evaluation. Grudem's case (see below) is criticised for confusing the authoritative gospel traditions (now enshrined as our New Testaments) and the ministry of teaching. It cannot be claimed that teaching carries authority of actual words any more than prophecy, for teaching requires the explication, interpretation and application of the gospel tradition. Teaching, as much as prophecy, needs to be evaluated and tested in terms of its legitimacy (see eg. Gal.1:8; 2 Tim.2:7; 1 Thess. 2:13). Inasmuch as both a teaching and prophecy are perceived to be genuine, their authority is the same, that is, derived from God, and it cannot be said one is more authoritative than the other.

The case against the ordination of women to the priesthood:

94. Those opposed to the ordination of women to the priesthood understand authentically simply to mean "to exercise authority". Thus it is argued that it is not teaching generally which is forbidden, but specifically authoritative teaching, or the holding of positions of authority over men in the Church.

95. The following references to Adam being the first created are therefore understood to provide the theological basis for Paul's instruction (cf 1 Cor. 11:2ff). A pattern was established in the creation order (see the section on Genesis 2 above) whereby men are to be regarded as the appropriate leaders. This creational order is to be reflected in the leadership of the church, and thus should be accepted as being for all times and in all places. Informal teaching may be permitted for women, but not the authoritative office of teaching.⁵¹

96. How this works out in practice varies. Some suggest that a woman may teach in Church in the presence of an Elder, for such teaching has no authority apart from the approval of the elders.⁵² Others propose that women may teach at home in the presence of their husbands (eg. in Bible studies), and possibly in Church, but that they are not to have the public office of teaching;⁵³ such teaching is not to be officially recognised or used in formal contexts. It has been proposed that a distinction is to be made between general teaching, and the ministry of the principal or senior teacher in a local church.⁵⁴ It has also been suggested that allowing a woman to teach on two or three occasions a year within a Church would constitute a less official category of teaching.⁵⁵

97. Others opposed to women's ordination would go further. Seeking to understand Paul's various passages concerning women as a whole, it is said that it is this notion of authority which explains why women may prophesy but not teach. Wayne Grudem differentiates between prophecy which has authority of actual words (which he associates with apostolic authority) and authority of general content (such as reflected in 1 Corinthians 14). He concludes that teaching is a more authoritative ministry than prophecy of general content, because the latter was subject to evaluation. For this reason, women may prophesy, for it had only general authority subject to evaluation. Teaching, however, was a responsibility of the ruling elders, and it is this governing authority which is forbidden women.⁵⁶

Why does Paul refer to –

a) the fact that Adam was formed first, not Eve?

The case in favour of the ordination of women to the priesthood:

98. It is considered that reference to 1 Cor.11:8 should be balanced by the qualification Paul himself made in 1 Cor.11:12. The significance of the fact that woman came from man is now qualified with the observation that men also come from women. Whatever Paul means in 1 Tim. 2:13, it cannot contradict this qualification. Calvin did not consider this aspect of Paul's argument weighty: it "does not seem to be very strong, for John the Baptist went before Christ in time and yet was far inferior to Him" (although he went on to accept the argument on the basis of Paul's apostolic authority).⁵⁷ Others make a similar point. Chronological order does not seem to play any significant role in Genesis 1 and 2. Men and women are the last to be created in Genesis 1, but are the climax of creation. The creation of the woman towards the end of Genesis 2 is the high point and climax of creation, bringing it to completion.

99. It is possible that this statement is a correction to some aspect of false teaching. There is evidence not too long after the New Testament period of speculation concerning Eve at creation, speculation giving her unwarranted pre-eminence. It could be (although it is acknowledged that this cannot be proven) that such speculations formed part of the "myths and endless genealogies" (1:4) characteristic of the false teachers in Ephesus.⁵⁸

100. Paul does not elaborate or spell out the significance of the fact that Adam was created first, except that it appears to be preparatory to the point of v14, that Adam, unlike Eve, was not the one who was deceived. If the two references to Genesis are linked, it may be that as Adam was formed first, he had been directly instructed by God (Gen.2:15-17) as to the realities of life in the garden. Eve, being created later, did not have the benefit of this direct instruction by God (although she certainly knew his commands), and thus was more vulnerable to deception, and consequently accepted disinformation (insinuations concerning God's

motives and integrity) and was deceived into sinning. Adam sinned too, but did so fully aware of his disobedience.

The case against the ordination of women to the priesthood:

101. This is sometimes said to be an example of primogeniture - that the first born son received a greater inheritance and the responsibility to become the head of the household upon the death of the father. Thus a responsibility for leadership is given to the first born, and it is this responsibility on males which is indicated here as a paradigm for the responsibility for males to exercise authority and leadership over females.

102. Reference is made to 1 Corinthians 11:8, and is understood as an allusion to Genesis 2. Thus, it implies the headship of men over women (see the hierarchies in the section on Genesis 2 above), and is therefore to be regarded as reflecting the creational ordering of the relationship between men and women. The headship of men over women is based on derivation. The fact that Adam was created first and that the husband is the head of the wife and *not vice versa* is clearly significant for Paul. It establishes something intrinsic and irreversible about the relationship between men and women.

103. There is no substantive evidence that this comment by Paul is in reference to false teaching. The evidence of gnostic thought concerning Eve is dated later than the Pauline period, and the suggested reconstructions are all speculative. The fact that the various proposed reconstructions often differ in detail and content indicates the tentative and uncertain status of such background theories.

104. Whatever the nature and basis of Paul's argument, it reflected his theological outlook, and should be accepted on the basis of his apostolic authority. The statement is introduced by the conjunction "for" (*gar*) which is usually used by Paul in a causal sense, meaning "because". Women are not to teach or have authority because the woman was not created first but Adam. These verses cannot be dismissed as simply reflecting the culture of the day because Paul argued his point on the basis of a theology of creation. As a result, these verses must be understood in terms of being for all times and all places. Women are called to submit to men because man was created first, not the woman. Genesis 2 is being used to establish a paradigm concerning the relationship between men and women in general.

b) the fact that Adam was not deceived, unlike the woman?

105. At this point we get to the nub of the references to Genesis. The notion of deception is the crux of Paul's point. Scripture is clear that both Adam and Eve sinned, and were responsible for their transgression. However, the part Adam and Eve played in the original disobedience can be distinguished in Paul's mind in that the woman was deceived into sinning, unlike Adam.

106. It has to be said that traditional exegesis of this verse is now generally rejected by evangelical expositors. The dominant view until recent times had been that Paul was arguing that women, following the pattern of Eve, were more gullible, credulous and prone to deception, and thus were less reliable teachers. It was something to do with the nature of women.⁵⁹ That this is what the author of the Pastorals meant is still maintained by most non-evangelical critical scholars.⁶⁰

107. The main reason for rejecting the idea that Paul is claiming that there is something in the nature of women which makes them unsuitable or inadequate teachers is that this would make him inconsistent, for it is clear that he does allow women to teach (at least) other women and children (Titus 2:3-4). Surely he would not encourage this if such teaching was likely to be unreliable. This consideration carries little weight for non-evangelical critical scholars. Few of them accept that Paul was the author of the Pastoral Epistles, and most simply conclude that the writer was simply inconsistent.

108. Because this verse is crucial for understanding this passage, and especially for how the references to Genesis are to be applied to women in ministry, it is worth taking some soundings as to the variety of evangelical expositions. There are two main interpretive options. Either Paul was referring to Eve as a *prototype* for all women generally (eg. the nature of Eve is true of the nature of all women), or as an *example* of how one woman chose to act in a certain set of circumstances, an example cited as a warning of behaviour to be avoided.

The case against the ordination of women to the priesthood:

109. James Hurley states that the creational model was one whereby the man had been prepared by God to be the religious leader, whereas the woman was not prepared to discern religious truths or falsehoods. Eve was to be "virtually" excused of her disobedience, for she had been deceived.⁶¹ G.N. Davies suggests that Paul generalises from the example of Eve not that women have "the attribute of gullibility, or the susceptibility to temptation, but rather the susceptibility to take the initiative in relationships..."⁶² For Davies, the point is not so much about the nature of women but the nature of the *temptation* which would come to women given their role in creation according to his understanding of Genesis 2. P W Barnett concludes that Paul's point is that "the reason a man should teach are related to Adam-his primacy and his resistance to transgression, not on a supposedly low opinion of women".⁶³

110. Expositors who take this line generally argue that Eve's example is that of someone who took a role for which she had not been created - that of the head, which belongs to men. Eve is used as an example of someone who reversed the creation order of relationships. If the reference to Eve's deception was in reference to local problems in Ephesus, why did Paul single women out for such strong censure? Surely it was not only the women who were influenced by the false teachers and were causing trouble? Why did Paul not simply forbid the false teachers to teach, or those influenced by the false teachers? The reference to Eve's deception is best understood as reflecting someone who acted outside their created order. She was deceived into taking the initiative in her relationship with Adam in a way forbidden by God. The women of Ephesus were not to follow her example.

111. The cases of Huldah and Deborah may be explained as being exceptional. Both exercised their ministry of prophecy differently to male prophets. Deborah did not prophesy in public, but seems to have restricted her prophetic role to private and individual contexts (Judg. 4:5). Similarly, Deborah exercised her role as judge differently to the male judges. She alone appeared to have no military function, and did not lead Israel into battle as did the other judges. By contrast, she handed over her leadership functions to a man. Similarly Huldah appears to have only spoken in private (2 Kings 22:14-20). Both the ministries of Huldah and Deborah may be understood as being quite consistent with the practice of male headship.⁶⁴

The case in favour of the ordination of women to the priesthood:

112. Criticism is levelled at the above views on the grounds that they retain echoes of the idea that the Paul is saying something about the nature of women. Regarding the view of Hurley, it is said that as he suggests this is the model to be followed today, the implication is that all women are ill-prepared (and therefore unable or unreliable?) to make religious pronouncements. Barnett's view is similarly critiqued. The implication of his interpretation appears to be that women do not share Adam's (and therefore men's) resistance to transgression. Davies' understanding of Paul also has something to say about the nature of women - that women generally are susceptible to take the initiative in relationships.

113. Furthermore, it is asked what "role" did Eve actually exercise over Adam? She merely took the fruit, ate, and passed it on to Adam, apparently without even speaking. It is hard to construe this as teaching or making religious pronouncements, or even as an example of exercising "headship". Surely this "headship" understanding of Genesis 2 and 3 (eg. head = spokesman, teacher, decision maker, initiator & leader), which Eve transgressed, has difficulty in accommodating the examples of Deborah (Judges 4:4ff) and Huldah (2 Kings 22:14ff). How, if the creational pattern of hierarchy which sets men over women is for all times and all places, could God both condone and work through the ministries of Deborah and Huldah, both of whom were married? There is no note in the Bible of exceptional circumstances giving rise to their ministries.⁶⁵

114. There is another line of interpretation which is quite consistent with Paul's usage of the Old Testament. Eve's deception is cited as cautionary typology.⁶⁶ This accords well with the only other occasion Paul cited Eve's deception (2 Cor. 11:3), where it is applied to the danger of members of the Corinthian church being led astray by false teachers. The language of "being deceived" and being "led astray" is used throughout the Pastoral epistles in reference to the false teachers.⁶⁷ Eve was being used as an example of the disastrous consequences which resulted when one woman accepted and passed on false teaching.⁶⁸ In other words, the logic of the example of Eve only applies in contexts where women are acting out of ignorance and being deceived, and influencing others as a result. In other circumstances where it is apparent that women are as well educated and capable teachers as men, Paul's use of Eve as an example is not relevant.

115. Why did Paul single out women and call for such drastic measures in calling for all women to stop teaching at Ephesus? This may be explained by a combination of three factors: 1) the false teachers had particular success amongst the women of Ephesus (cf. 2 Tim. 3:6-7), with widespread disturbances resulting; 2) the content of the false teaching may have been directly concerned with the place of women, resulting in an overly assertive and dominant attitude evidenced by many of the women. We know that the false teachers forbade marriage (1 Tim.4:3), and probably taught some form of realised eschatology;⁶⁹ and 3) the women of Ephesus were generally not well educated and equipped to respond to the false teaching. In such circumstances, the strategy to combat such successful false teaching amongst women would need to be drastic.

116. Verse 15 is difficult to interpret by all sides. It has no clear bearing on the issue except to illustrate that there are aspects of this passage which are clearly not straight forward.

Theological Issues:

The church as "family" and leadership roles in the church:

117. This argument for differentiating between men and women within role relationships in the Church is based on theological inference rather than a specific passage of Scripture. One of the most common images for the Church in the New Testament is that of a family. As we as believers place our faith in the heavenly Father, we are automatically placed into familial relationship with brothers and sisters in Christ. Thus the

Church can be described as "the household of God" (1 Tim.3:15). What implications may be drawn from this for issues of leadership in the Church?

The case against the ordination of women to the priesthood:

118. Proponents of this view argue that just as there is a certain pattern of roles in marriage in which husbands are called to exercise leadership and wives are called to submit to and receive such leadership, should we not reasonably conclude that leadership patterns in the church will similarly reflect such role distinctions? As a husband is the head of his wife and family, so too the leadership of the church belongs to men. Just as the metaphor of family is applied to the church, the parallels between the proper ordering of church relationships and family roles can be expected to carry over into leadership roles in the church. Thus all that Paul had to say about husbands and wives in Ephesians 5:21f and Colossians 3:18-19 is applicable within the family of God.⁷⁰

119. Whilst Paul did not explicitly call wives to obey their husbands, Peter did so in 1 Peter 3, using Sarah's obedience to Abraham as a paradigm for Christian wives. Furthermore, it can be argued that the word for "submit" (*hypotasso*) has a semantic range which can include the notion of obedience. The call for submission in Ephesians 5:21 is best understood as being illustrated by the various relationships that follow. Wives are to submit to their husbands, children to their parents, slaves to their masters. The notion of submission is most naturally understood as being submission to a person who has some sort of leadership responsibility and authority. Consequently, submission is a relationship term, and applies specifically to ordered relationships where there is some recognition of authority and leadership.

120. Submission applies both to the proper ordering of family relationships (wives to husbands, children to parents) and to the proper recognition of those who are over us in the Lord, leaders in the church (1 Thess. 5:12; Heb. 13:7,17). It is quite appropriate for the ordering of the relationship between men and women to be recognised and reflected in the ordering of ministry within the church, especially as the male-female relationship is established in a theology of creation. There is one passage where the role of the father within the family household is applied to leadership within God's household, the church (1 Tim. 3:4-5). The management task of both the father and the church leader are the same.

The case in favour of the ordination of women to the priesthood:

121. Adherents to this perspective dispute the above argument on a number of grounds. Firstly, it seeks to apply a metaphor in a way in which no New Testament passage does. In other words, it is not based on any specific New Testament teaching. The church as God's family metaphor is nowhere applied to the issue of leadership, and there are a number of dissimilarities which suggest the parallel between family relationships and church are overdrawn and inappropriate when applied in this manner. The family metaphor is used in the New Testament to emphasise believers relationships as brothers and sisters. We are to call no man "father" (Matthew 23:9) except God himself. This is not so much a literal and legal concern over the use of the term "father", but a recognition that it is to God himself that we are to submit. Similarly, Paul is quite specific in that Christ is the head of the church, and never describes any leader as head, nor parallels leadership in the church on Christ's headship.

122. Furthermore, it is not clear what specific role differences are to be found between husbands and wives. It is accepted that husbands are called "head", but exactly what this means is subject to a great variety of interpretations. The analogy of Christ's headship is applied to husbands at one level: "The husband's responsibility is described by Paul by analogy to Christ's self-sacrificial love for the church".⁷¹ It is notable that Paul does not call on wives to obey their husbands, in contrast to children to parents and slaves to masters. The headship image does not readily fit into leadership/obedience demarcation of roles for husband and wives, for this is not the emphasis of the Ephesian passage.

123. Finally, it is argued that to apply a metaphor from one context into another is methodologically illegitimate. The point of the reference to the overseer's home responsibilities in 1 Tim. 3:5 is specific: that similar leadership skills are required in the church. It is not equating fatherhood generally to church leadership. Should the role of an apostle be similarly understood as that of a nursing mother (1 Thess. 2:7)? The family metaphor for the church is only one image among many. The church as God's temple is another. What would happen if we applied this metaphor to the issue of leadership roles within the church, for the temple concept has much to say about leadership functions? The same "parallel" methodology could be used to justify the introduction of priestly functions which few evangelicals would want to accept. To apply a metaphor used in one context to another context without the guidance of any specific scriptural teaching is fraught with problems.

The nature of authority in the context of ministry within the church.

124. A distinction is properly drawn between ecclesiastical authority and what may be termed "charismatic authority". Ordination recognises and affirms charismatic authority, but can confer only ecclesiastical authority, which is of the same order of authority as exercised by any organisation, secular or otherwise.

125. The Synod report on Ordination⁷² makes just this point.

"There are two ways in which the term 'authority' is commonly used in connection with ordination.

First, insofar as ordination is the *recognition* by the church of the gifts and calling of a candidate, the 'authority' which he thus possesses will be the authority of God exercised through the ministry of God's Word in the mouth of his minister. The church cannot confer, but only recognize, this authority.

But secondly, insofar as ordination involves the *legitimate exercise of discretion* by a church in ordering its life in terms of Article 23, it is right to speak of that church exercising its own constitutional authority and thus giving authority to a person to officiate in the congregation.

But the distinction between divine authority and ecclesiastical authority is a very old one, and since both the 39 Articles and the Ordinal, where they use the term 'authority', would seem to refer to ecclesiastical rather than divine authority, it would be misleading for us to avoid such a usage. Ecclesiastical authority is God-given, as is all legitimate authority (Rom.13:1), but it is authority such as may be exercised by any earthly organisation and is of a different kind from the authority which God exercises directly through the ministry of his Word."

126. Charismatic authority is the authority that comes through the giving of a spiritual gift, a *charisma*, from God, with the clearly implied responsibility to exercise that gift appropriately for the edification of the church. As a ministry is recognised as being faithful to the gospel traditions and inspired by the Spirit, then respect is called for that person's ministry, and such ministry is "authoritative" and "legitimate". This is true, irrespective of whether the minister is officially set apart or not. It is inherent to the ministry derived from God. Authority at this level is exactly the same for ordained persons and lay people. The goal for the church as it seeks to regulate ministry is to *overlap* the ordering of ministry as closely as possible to the apparent empowering of ministry by and through the Holy Spirit.

127. The process of ordination may *heighten* the recognition of charismatic authority, and bestow additional ecclesiastical authority, but the charismatic authority inherent through the bestowal of a *charisma*, a gift for ministry, remains the same.

128. Where some argue that women are to have restricted authority within the church, there needs to be some clarification as to which category of authority is in view, and how that relates to the ordination process.

Hermeneutical models:

129. The hermeneutical model pursued by both sides of this debate is by and large agreed (but see "Dissenting view concerning methodology", paras 141-144), as is the understood doctrine of Scripture.

130. Regarding hermeneutical method, it is generally agreed that Scripture contains both timeless and eternal truths which transcend cultures, as well as specific statements expressed in terms relevant to the cultural and social setting of the original recipients. Such statements need to be analysed to determine the underlying general principle, and such truths re-applied in terms which are appropriate to our circumstances.

131. Scripture is also progressive. There are specific statements made to God's people under the Old Covenant which are made redundant with the coming of Christ. There are elements of the creation order which are universally part of God's created pattern, and other parts which will be transformed in the new creation order of the Kingdom when fully inaugurated. The relationship between men and women as expressed in marriage is an example of such transformation, for in heaven, such will "neither marry nor be given in marriage" (Luke 20:35). The theologian's hermeneutical task is to be sensitive to such developments in Scripture, as well as recognising eternal truths.

132. Such a hermeneutical model and method is generally held in common on both sides of the debate within the evangelical community. Differences arise not so much in the model, but the data fed in.

A note concerning interpretive method:

133. Why do evangelicals disagree about what the Bible has to say concerning the ministry of women? We have seen that there are differences concerning particular exegetical details, some of which are gradually being resolved, others simply reflecting different hermeneutical judgements.

134. The method adopted by this report has been to follow the chronological order of Scripture as it has been progressively revealed. We have sought to understand each text within its own initial context, before moving to consider how such texts have been appropriated by later writers of Scripture. An interpretive circle is developed, where each passage is utilised to mutually inform other passages. Yet at some stage the interpreter must decide where to balance the weight of such interpretations. In the context of passages concerning women, do we start with 1 Corinthians 11 and 1 Timothy 2, and use them as our control in

interpreting Genesis 2; or do we seek to understand Genesis 2 in its own right, and then determine whether the Pauline passages can be reasonably understood in terms consistent with our understanding of Genesis 2. It must be understood that these are passages which require conclusions of fine judgement - a balancing of exegetical possibilities.

135. This matter comes to a focus when consideration is given to "headship theology". The term "headship" does not occur in the Bible. It is the name given to a perceived theological pattern, based initially on 1 Corinthians 11 where the notion of "headship" is understood to be based on an appeal to the chronological order of creation in Genesis 2 (1 Cor. 11:3, 8 & 9), and reinforced by reference to Ephesians 5:21-33, which states that the husband is head over the wife. This headship pattern is then applied to other passages such as 1 Timothy 2:11-15 where the term "head" is not used, but where reference is also made to the chronological order of creation in Genesis 2, and where the terminology of submission is used. Thus it is argued that in the light of such an understanding of the Pauline passages, our exegesis of Genesis 2 should be understood as reflecting (if not explicitly stating) a "headship" hierarchical pattern of relationships.

136. It is to be noted that such an interpretive method differs from that adopted by the main report above, and that some evangelicals who argue against the ordination of women to the priesthood would pursue a different interpretive framework to that adopted by this report.

137. One method is to start with each passage understood within its original context, noting how, on balance, each passage is best understood independently, and further noting areas where there may be interpretive ambiguity or uncertainty. From this initial investigation, consideration is then given to the canonical shape of Scripture, and how each passage should be understood alongside other passages, and theologically analysing any patterns which emerge.

138. It is argued by evangelicals in favour of women's ordination to the priesthood that the Pauline passages can be quite reasonably understood without requiring "headship" to be read into passages where the term "head" is not used. The appeal to a "headship" theological pattern begs the question of what theological weight and application was intended by the apostle in using the word "head". This is more than a lexical debate about whether the word means "authority over" or "source". If the metaphorical range of meaning for "head" is varied (which is now generally agreed), what indications do we get from the context in 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 which may explain how Paul intended the word to be understood and applied? It is argued (see above) that the only reference to authority in this passage is given to women in their own right as women (v.10), and that the explicit emphasis of the passage is in highlighting the mutually inter-dependent partnership of men and women (vv. 11 & 12). Similarly, it is argued that in Ephesians 5:21-33, the model for the husband as head of the wife in this passage is *not* a creational order based on Genesis 2, but christological, where the example of Christ is applied to husbands to emphasise their responsibility to exercise sacrificial love. It is further suggested that 1 Timothy 2:11-15 may be better understood within its own context without the need to import a "headship" framework.

139. To portray the difference in broad terms, it may be argued that the differences between evangelicals often amount to whether Paul is used to control the exegesis of Genesis 2, or whether Genesis 2 is used to control the exegesis of the Pauline passages (although this omits the fact that there are still exegetical differences of interpretation concerning the passages, even understood in their own right). Of course, all passages are used to inform one another, but in reality a greater weighting is given to one side of the circle or the other. Much depends on where the interpreter starts, and how Paul is considered to have employed the references to Genesis.

140. Furthermore, it is argued that the interpretation of each passage must be weighed against the broader presentation of Scripture taking into consideration not only didactic passages concerning the ministry of women, but also descriptive passages which reflect how God used women in various ministries at different times. Respect for the canonical shape of Scripture must also recognise that such accounts are also included in the Bible for our edification, and that no theological patterns should be entertained which contradict the apparent working of God through a number of significant women, or which contradicts apostolic practice. Thus some of those who believe that headship theology has been overstated argue that there are some examples of Scripture which appear to contradict "headship" patterns. This, it is argued, suggests either (at the least) that such "headship" is not for all times and all places, or (more seriously) that the "headship" hierarchical view of relationships between men and women has been erroneously construed. Proponents of the headship view argue in reply that the evidence is ambiguous or may reflect exceptional circumstances. Didactic passages of Scripture should be used to control our interpretation of narrative passages.

141. If certain passages are set aside from our considerations in favour of other passages, then the canonical shape of Scripture is not being respected, and the notion of Scriptural authority denied. This must be considered as a denial of apostolic traditions. However, evangelicals in favour of women's ordination to the priesthood are not arguing this option. The canonical shape and authority of Scripture is affirmed. From

an evangelical stance, the debate concerns how each passage is to be understood in its own right, and how the relevant passages are to be understood collectively, reflecting a reasonable, coherent and consistent theological pattern.

Dissenting view concerning methodology (Canon R E Heslehurst)

142. While agreeing that the positions explored in this paper represent the majority views on each side, I wish to dissent from a significant part of the report. The report suggests that the area of hermeneutical method is common. This may be true but even in the light of the "Note concerning interpretive method" it is this very issue that needs to be further explored. Two issues have not been addressed sufficiently, yet they underlie the weakness of both positions in the report. They are the question of the status of the authors of the Biblical material and the issue of the Canonical shape of that material.

143. The use of the grammatico-syntactical method to obtain "the teaching of Scripture" is very valuable. Yet it is not thereby to be seen as the locus of authority. It is clear that such a method will *not* lead one to postulate an "order of authority" clearly or absolutely from the Genesis 2 material. It might be suggested but not asserted. I would say such an order is clearly implied and argued for in both 1 Corinthians 11 and 1 Timothy 2. It raises the question of exegetical method. Am I free to discount apostolic analysis because my own method reaches a different conclusion? This is often implied. John Calvin's comment (quoted correctly in this report) is often used as a shorthand to do this. "Yet the reason which Paul assigns, that the woman was second in the order of creation, appears not to be a very strong argument in favour of her subjection".⁷³ But such an editing of Calvin fails to take account of the end of the same paragraph, "the Apostle justly reminds us that the order of creation in which the eternal and inviolable appointment of God is strikingly displayed".⁷⁴ As a church we are not free to interpret Scripture in a way which contradicts Apostolic analysis. In my opinion, this equally weakens both the pro-ordination case and the case of those who wish to intrude some kind of "executive office" model drawn from twentieth century business management into the argument so as to allow women to teach in church while claiming to be faithful to the Apostolic position. Paul, in 1 Timothy 2, does not forbid "ordination"; he forbids "teaching"! Contrary to some I do not think this is a local command for the purpose of restraining heretics in Ephesus. If this is so then given the nature of the Anglican Priesthood, means that women are forbidden the office by Apostolic command as would the occasional or regular preaching of women in church.

144. The second hermeneutical question is that of the Canon. We have not received the books of the Bible as separate documents. Whilst it is true that we must first approach them as individual documents, we cannot leave it there. The New Testament books did not even exist in the Church as separate books but as books added to an already existing canon. The canonical shape of the material must be respected. They come to us as scripture and not as "notes on how the apostles did it in some churches". Both evangelical positions in this debate are likely to find the real loss will be the Canon itself! This area raises for us, as Anglicans, the significant area of authority in our church.

145. I do not think that these two issues have been given the stress needed and thus weaken the debate on both sides. Either of the major positions in this report, in my opinion, will be at the cost of Canon and Apostle.

Additional Comment (Mrs M Gabbott)

146. The attempt to produce a comprehensive report indicating the nature of the arguments for and against the ordination of women to the Anglican priesthood is to be commended as a reasonable expression of the conservative evangelical views of the matter.

147. However, as a woman opposed to the ordination of women to the Anglican priesthood but wanting very much to see ministries by women valued and extended in the denomination, I want to indicate that I believe the case against the ordination of women to the Anglican priesthood is framed more negatively than is necessary.

148. I recognise that terms such as "subordinate", "subordination", "hierarchy" and "secondary position" are used in the relevant literature. However, I have come to a position where I believe that these terms are unhelpful for two reasons - they do not occur in the relevant Scriptures and they now carry meanings that contribute to a confusion of understanding concerning the issues involved.⁷⁵

Issues needing further investigation

149. What is the relationship between Priests within the Anglican Church of Australia and the role of Rectors? Some argue that the Ordinal understands that the two are the same. Others suggest that patterns of ministry are now much more varied than the Ordinal anticipated. The process of ordaining Priests is separate from induction into a parish. Similarly, the process of authorisation is separate. According to the 1992 Year Book, there are a significant number of Priests (just less than a third) active within ministry in our

Diocese who are not, and never have been, Rectors or Curates-In-Charge, including a number of the heads of Diocesan organisations.

150. Should priests be kept to just those who are Rectors, in which case ordination should be at the same time as the induction, and lapse upon relinquishing the position?⁷⁶ Or do we go with current practice and recognise that a number of priests may not be rectors but have other positions (eg. diocesan appointments, ministry in team contexts, chaplaincies etc.)?

151. Is there scope for ordaining women as priests and considering the appointment of such women as rectors as a separate issue?

152. Further consultation needs to be made with women involved in full time ministry, and a survey made of their experiences and perceptions. This is particularly important concerning those women who have been ordained as deacons regarding their post ordination ministry experiences.

153. How may we heighten recognition of the value of women's ministry within the Diocese?

154. Further consideration is needed as to how women's ministry may be ordered within our Diocesan structures. Should some extension of non-presbyteral forms of ministry be investigated? Financial support for women's ministry also needs more serious consideration, especially to provide the necessary finance to recruit, train, support and provide some level of security for women who wish to minister within our denomination.

155. The ministry of women within team ministries requires further exploration. What have been the experiences of women at a relational and practical level within team ministries? Are there a range of ministries within a team ministry context that have yet to be considered?

156. What forums do we have in the Diocese for further dialogue and investigation on matters concerning the ministry of women, both at a theological and practical level?

Recommendations

157. That this report be tabled and received by Synod, and made available to parishes at cost.

For and on behalf of the Committee

T J HARRIS
Secretary

July, 1993



Endnotes

¹ See the April 9, 1990 issue of *Christianity Today*, for the centre page advertisement for the organisation bearing that title. The Sydney based group *Men, Women and God* is formally affiliated with the United States organisation, and also uses and adopts the description *Christians for Biblical Equality*.

² There is a negligible difference between these two. The "traditional" view indicates acceptance of the arguments which have been traditionally associated with restricting women from ordained ministry. The "traditionalist" view similarly endorses this position, but adds to it the need to maintain the prevailing tradition concerning women's ordination in the church.

³ See J. Piper and W. Grudem (eds), *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, (Crossway Books, 1991), representing the views of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood associated with the Danvers Statement.

⁴ Note the review of the Piper/Grudem volume by K. Giles, forthcoming in *Evangelical Quarterly*, which makes this point.

⁵ See especially J.T. Walsh, "Gen 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach." *JBL*, 96 (1977).

⁶ V.P. Hamilton comments: "Thus the new creation will be neither a superior nor an inferior, but an equal. The creation of this helper will form one-half of a polarity, and will be to man as the south pole is to the north pole." *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, NICOT, (Eerdmans, 1990), 175.

⁷ G.W. Ramsey, "Is Name-Giving an Act of Domination in Gen 2:23 and Elsewhere?", *CBQ*, 50 (1988), 35

⁸ A strong restatement of the patriarchal orientation of this passage has been made by A. Gardner, "Genesis 2:4b-3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality or of the Religious History of Pre-exilic Israel?", *Scot. Journ. of Theol.*, 43.

⁹ J.W. Woodhouse, "The ordination of Women, Why not?", *Australian Church Record*, (May 6, 1985), 5.

¹⁰ *Genesis: A Commentary*, (SCM, 1972), 83.

¹¹ G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, Word Biblical Commentary, (Word, 1987), 70.

¹² See eg. P. Tribble, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, (Fortress Press, 1978), 99.

¹³ See especially Gardner, 8.

¹⁴ Note R.C. Ortlund Jr, "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship: Genesis 1-3", in Piper and Grudem, *Manhood and Womanhood*, esp 104; and D.J.A. Clines, "What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Irredeemably Androcentric Orientations in Genesis 1-3", in *What Does Eve do to Help? and Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament*, JSOT Supp 94 (Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).

- ¹⁵ Gardner, 6.
- ¹⁶ For further detail, see Walsh, and Wenham, 49-51. Interestingly, Walsh notes that 3:20-21 does not fit within the structure, 169.
- ¹⁷ J.W. Woodhouse, "the Ordination of Women: Are the Arguments Biblical". *Southern Cross* (parts 1 & 2: June & July, 1985).
- ¹⁸ R.C. Doyle, "Created Male and Female: Sexuality, Personhood and the Image of God", in *Personhood, Sexuality, and Christian Ministry*, (Explorations, 1986), 47.
- ¹⁹ See especially the treatment by Hamilton, *Genesis*, 182-185.
- ²⁰ *What Does Eve Do to Help?*, 35-36
- ²¹ S.T. Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire?", *WTJ*, 37 (1974/5), 376-83. Foh arrives at this understanding from observing a grammatical parallel with Gen 4:7.
- ²² Clause Watermann comments "The sentences on the woman (3:16) and the man (vv17-19) do not reflect acts of punishment; ... but rather describe the limited nature of human existence in its separation from God.", *Genesis: A Practical Commentary*, (Eerdmans, 1987), 25.
- ²³ For further details, consult K. Giles, public lecture at St John's Parramatta, June 27, 1992, available on audio tape.
- ²⁴ C.B. Forbes in reference to the work of E.A. Judge, public lecture at St John's Parramatta, June 27, 1992, available on audio tape. Chrysostom understood the name as referring to a female; for a review of the evidence, see C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, (T&T Clark, 1979), vol II, 788.
- ²⁵ Cranfield, 785.
- ²⁶ Evidence relating to this term is considered by G.H.R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, Vol 4, (Macquarie University, 1987), 243.
- ²⁷ C. Kruse, "Human Relationships in the Pauline Corpus", in *In the Fullness of Time: Biblical Studies in Honour of Archbishop Donald Robinson*, ed. D.G. Peterson & J. Pryor, (Lancer, 1992), 174.
- ²⁸ 1.16.9-14. For a discussion of such references, consult Forbes, audio tape.
- ²⁹ It is not clear whether Paul is referring to hair style or head dress.
- ³⁰ For the range of meanings, see Grudem "Does *kephale* ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples". *Trin J*, ns 6 (1985) although the title in his article does not reflect the possibility of such a range of meanings.
- ³¹ "*Dia* followed by a noun in the accusative case can indicate the reason why something happens, results or exists: *because of, for the sake of.*" It may also indicate the "efficient cause", ie "*through*": See Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, "A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature", (Chicago, 1958 2nd Ed.), 179-181, BII.1 & BII.4; see also Blass, Debrunner and Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, (University of Chicago Press, 1961), entries 222 and 223.
- ³² According to Blass, Debrunner and Funk, the word which introduces this clause "*plen*" is used by Paul "to conclude a discussion and emphasise what is essential". 234
- ³³ See R. Oster, "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11:4". *NTS*, 34, 1988. Oster demonstrates that veils could symbolise *piety*, but produces no evidence to illustrate how veils could be used to delineate the respective relationship between males and females.
- ³⁴ G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, (Eerdmans, 1987), 505.
- ³⁵ See most recently, W.A. Grudem, "The Meaning of *Kephale* ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies". Appendix 1 in Piper & Grudem (eds.), *Manhood and Womanhood*.
- ³⁶ W.A. Grudem, "Prophecy - Yes, but Teaching - No: Paul's Consistent Advocacy of Women's Participation Without Governing Authority". *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, (1987) 11-23.
- ³⁷ See W.A. Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians*. (University Press of America, 1982) 251-255.
- ³⁸ D.A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Lancer, 1988), 128-129.
- ³⁹ Carson, 129.
- ⁴⁰ Forbes, public lecture.
- ⁴¹ P.W. Barnett in correspondence to T.J. Harris, letter dated November 10, 1989.
- ⁴² See especially G.D. Fee. "Reflections on Church Order in the Pastoral Epistles, with Further Reflection on the Hermeneutics of *ad hoc* Documents". *JETS* 28 (1985). Dick Lucas has noted how Fee's work has changed his whole approach to the Pastoral Epistles: see *The Briefing*, #36: even D.J. Moo, someone who on the whole generally continues to take a very conservative approach to this passage, has noted that this is one area where he has changed his mind and now accepts that the letters were written to specific circumstances: "It is likely that the false teaching does give rise to Paul's instruction in 2:9-15", to which he adds a footnote commenting "This represents a change from my earlier view". In Piper & Grudem, *Manhood and Womanhood*, 189, 498 n25.
- ⁴³ Some take this to mean that certain Christians (in the context of Ephesians 5 & 6, wives, children and slaves) are to submit to other Christians (husbands, parents and masters respectively). For this view, see J.B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, (IVP), 1981). 139-144, and the editorial note in Piper & Grudem, *Manhood and Womanhood*, 493-494. Other scholars argue that to submit to one another is something fully reciprocal, following the normal pattern of the "one another" exhortations characteristic in Paul's writings. There is to be no restriction as to other Christians to whom we are called to submit within fellowship. For this view, see G.W. Knight III, "Husbands and Wives as Analogues of Christ and the Church: Ephesians 5:21-33 and Colossians 3:18-19", in Piper & Grudem, *Manhood and Womanhood*, 166-168.
- ⁴⁴ P.W. Barnett, "Wives and Women's Ministry (1 Timothy 2:11-15)", *Evangelical Quarterly*, 61:3 (1989), esp. 230-233.
- ⁴⁵ See T.J. Harris, "Why did Paul Mention Eve's Deception? A Critique of P.W. Barnett's Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2." *Evangelical Quarterly*, 62:4 (1990, esp. 341 n19. Similarly, G.W. Knight III, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, NIGTC. (Eerdmans, 1992), "Paul uses functional language ('to teach') rather than office language ('a bishop') to express the prohibition", 141.
- ⁴⁶ G.W. Knight III, "AUTHENTEIO in Reference to 1 Timothy 2:12". *New Testament Studies*, 30, (1984), esp. 154-155.
- ⁴⁷ L.E. Wilshire, "The TLG Computer an Further Reference to AUTHENTEIO in 1 Timothy 2,12", *New Testament Studies*, 34, (1988).
- ⁴⁸ Wilshire, "TLG", 131.
- ⁴⁹ L.E. Wilshire, "1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited: A Reply to Paul W. Barnett and Timothy J. Harris", *Evangelical Quarterly*, 65:1 (1993), 48.

- ⁵⁰ J.P. Louw and E.A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, (United Bible Societies, 1989, 2nd Ed.), Vol. 1. 474.
- ⁵¹ See especially Barnett, "Wives and Women's Ministry".
- ⁵² Hurley, 248.
- ⁵³ D.A. Carson, public lecture at Moore College, Sydney, September 10, 1985.
- ⁵⁴ Barnett, 237.
- ⁵⁵ G.N. Davies, public lecture at St John's Parramatta, June 27, 1992, available on audio tape.
- ⁵⁶ W.A. Grudmen, "Prophecy - Yes, but Teaching - No: Paul's Consistent Advocacy of Women's Participation Without Governing Authority", *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, (1987) 11-23.
- ⁵⁷ *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries*, D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance (eds), (Eerdmans, 1964), Vol 10, 217.
- ⁵⁸ Relevant evidence is cited in R.C. Kroeger & C.c. Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence*, (Baker, 1992), esp. 105-170.
- ⁵⁹ This is the consistent line of interpretation found in M. Henry, J.H. Bernard, E.F. Scott, E.K. Simpson, D. Guthrie (Tyndale Commentary), A.G. Nute, A. Stibbs (New Bible Commentary) and R.A. Ward. D.J. Moo initially pursued this line, then explicitly abandoned it. Guthrie too rejects this line in his more recent work.
- ⁶⁰ eg A.T. Hanson, J.N.D. Kelly.
- ⁶¹ Hurley, 215-216.
- ⁶² G.N. Davies, "1 Timothy 2:8-15", in B.G. Webb (ed.), *Personhood, Sexuality and Christian Ministry*, Explorations: Moore Papers No 1, (Sydney, 1986).
- ⁶³ Barnett, 234.
- ⁶⁴ This analysis of Huldah and Deborah is based on the article by T.R. Schreiner, "The Valuable Ministries of Women in the Context of Male Leadership: A Survey of Old and New Testament Examples and Teaching", in Piper & Grudem, *Manhood and Womanhood*, 216.
- ⁶⁵ See Harris, 347, esp. n38.
- ⁶⁶ For another example of this method of referring to an OT incident, see 1 Cor. 10:1-13, esp v11 "These things happened to them as examples and were written down as warnings for us...".
- ⁶⁷ See especially P.H. Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles*, JSNT Supp. Ser. 34, (JSOT Press, 1989), 216-222.
- ⁶⁸ See A. Padgett, "Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Timothy 2:8-15 in Social Context", *Interpretation*, XLI, (1987); D.M. Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the Place of Women in the Churches Ministry", in A. Mickelsen, *Women, Authority and the Bible*, (IVP, 1986).
- ⁶⁹ There has been extensive work done on the nature and impact of the false teachers; see especially Fee, "Ad Hoc Documents"; and Towner, *Goal of Our Instruction*.
- ⁷⁰ An argument along these lines was developed by D.G. Peterson, public lecture at St John's Parramatta, June 27, 1992, available on audio tape.
- ⁷¹ J.W. Woodhouse. "The Ordination of Women: Are the Arguments Biblical?", *Southern Cross* (July, 1985).
- ⁷² *Ordination: Its Meaning, Value and Theology*, A Report to Sydney Diocesan Synod, (AIO, 1981), 5-6. Italics are in the original.
- ⁷³ Calvin, 68.
- ⁷⁴ Calvin, 69.
- ⁷⁵ See further, H. Blarmires, *Where do we stand?*, (SPCK), 114.
- ⁷⁶ The Synod report *Ordination: Its Meaning, Value and Theology*, 13-14, argues that such a practice would be more consistent with the wording of the Ordinal.